

### REMARKS

Claims 1-27 were submitted for examination. Claims 1-27 have been rejected. Claims 21-26 have been canceled. Claims 1, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12-18, and 20 have been amended. Unchanged claims are included for the convenience of the Examiner.

No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration and reexamination of the above-referenced patent application, is respectfully requested.

### 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection – Ranganathan

Claims 1, 4-9, 12-18, 21-23, and 25-26 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,801,811 to Ranganathan ("Ranganathan").

Independent claim 1 recites in part:

"a control device to select two or more portions of the display screen to be brighter than remaining portions of the display screen in accordance with a display power management protocol."

(Emphasis added).

Ranganathan teaches energy-aware software that includes a mechanism to determine the screen area of focus in which the user is interested. (col. 2, lines 64-66)...the solution requires that environment to be reconfigured for automatically decreasing the intensity of the display in areas of the screen other than the window of focus. (col. 9, lines 11-15; Fig. 2B). Once the screen area (or window) of focus is determined, such area can be brightly lit, changed in color...while the remaining screen areas can be turned off, dimly illuminated, etc. (col. 12, lines 57-61). Thus, Ranganathan teaches highlighting only one portion

of the screen which is the area or window of focus. Ranganathan, however, does not teach having two or more portions of the display screen to be brighter than the remaining portions, as claimed in claim 1.

Applicant submits that the 102(e) rejection based on Ranganathan has been overcome, and claim 1 is patentable over Ranganathan. Since claims 2-11 depend from and further limit claim 1, they are also patentable over Ranganathan. At least for the same reason, applicant submits that independent claim 12 and its dependent claims 13-20 are also patentable over Ranganathan.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection – Ranganathan & Beeteson

Claims 2-3 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranganathan in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,796,382 to Beeteson ("Beeteson").

Since claim 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, and since claim 1 as presented above is patentable over Ranganathan, applicant submits that this rejection has been overcome.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection – Ranganathan & Sliber

Claims 10-11, 19-20 and 24 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranganathan in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,041 to Sliber ("Sliber").

Claim 24 has been canceled. Since claims 10-11 depend from claim 1, and claims 19-20 depend from claim 12, and since claims 1 and 12 as presented above are patentable over Ranganathan, applicant submits that this rejection has been overcome.


CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call David Tran at (408) 765-4692.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0221 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 14, 2005 \_\_\_\_\_

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David N. Tran  
Attorney of Record for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 50,804  
Direct Phone No. (408) 765-4692